

CLARK COUNTY ANIMAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES

**CLARK COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER
500 S. Grand Central Parkway, Commission Chambers
Las Vegas, Nevada 89121
November 20, 2014
6:30 p.m.**

MEMBERS PRESENT: EDWARDS, JANELLE (STUDENT)
EVANS, KEITH (KE)
GIPAYA, MARY (MG)
LAYNE, KAREN (KL)
SAYEGH, SUSAN S. (SSS)
WHITE, DEBBIE (DW)

1. Call to Order

KL called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

2. Public Comment

KL asked for public comment. No public comment was made, KL closed public comment.

3. Approval of Agenda

KL discussed items four and five on the agenda. She suggested item five is presented before item four. Committee felt no need to switch the items. KL asked for a motion to approve the agenda as it stands. Motion by SSS, second by DW, all in favor. Motion passed.

4. Discuss and Take Action on Proposed Changes to Title 10

KL stated that Jason Allswang (JA), Clark County Chief of Code Enforcement, would put the proposed ordinance changes on the monitor screens. KL wanted to take the changes by sections, with committee comment and public comment made specific to the item being discussed. She wanted the committee to further discuss the comments made and decide whether to accept or not accept the changes.

KL asked the committee if they have any changes to section 10.04 as it is currently presented. No committee comment. KL questioned the definition of retailers, section 10.04.255. JA took the definition directly from the NRS. No further discussion was made. Under 10.04.253, KL questioned the necessity of the statement “and files any variant of Form 990 annually”. JA stated it adds an extra layer of legitimacy to an organization. KE and JA discussed tax filings for rescue organizations. KL questioned the origin of section 10.04.285 and JA stated the code is directly from NRS. KL asked if animal tagging needs to be defined and JA stated it can be added to the definitions section.

KL opened public comment on 10.04. Don Kudler, a member of the public, commented on the confusing structure and wordiness of animals at large, section 10.04.100. No further comments from the public; KL closed public comment.

KL asked JA for clarification about 10.04.100. JA stated the wordiness is to eliminate ambiguity for animal control officer interpretation. Steve Sweikert (SS), Clark County Deputy District Attorney, suggested a rewording of the section. KL asked for a motion to make said changes to “at large” section and define animal tagging. SSS motioned, second by MG, all in favor, no opposition. Motion passed.

KL asked for committee comments to section 10.08. No committee comment. KL addressed section 10.08.095 and stated public park postings are left out of the ordinance. JA said it can be

added to the ordinance. DW stated, as a veterinarian, keeping track of pet store relationships is counterproductive and a waste of time. JA commented that this section is verbatim from state code. KL questioned the agreement between 10.08.132(a) and 10.08.135(e). JA clarified that once the animal is sold or is planning on being sold, it needs to be sterilized. KL said she wanted the language between the two sections to be clear. KL asked about 10.04.275, the definition of “show”, and JA displayed the definition. DW asked about dog sterilization language as new technologies, such as Zeuterin, become popular. Discussion was had about the use of Zeuterin and embedding it into Title 10. DW was concerned about 10.08.132(e) and stated public would be scared to seek Veterinary help based on the code. JA stated the language allows officers to seize breeders’ animals and discourages their illegal behavior.

KL opened public comment on 10.08. Don Kudler, a member of the public, thought business relationships should be defined as contractual relationships in 10.08.095. He commented on 10.08.132(e), asking if it is the buyer’s responsibility to verify the breeder’s licensure. He also asked if it is appropriate to seize a buyer’s dog who is unaware of the breeder’s violation. Janice Ridondo, North Las Vegas citizen, suggested 10.08.132(e) eliminate the language “8 weeks” or add “and 8 pounds” when referring to piglets. She asked JA what paperwork pet stores must provide. JA stated pet stores must give veterinarian paperwork and to contact animal control if they do not provide it. She commented on 10.08.132(e) with a found grammatical error. Lastly, Ridondo commented on the need for pot belly pig breeding language and eliminating pot belly pig breeding altogether in Clark County. She clarified when selling piglets, the animals should not be under 8 pounds. Crystal Han, Vegas Pig Pets, asked about spay and neuter procedures for pot belly pigs in 10.08.132(a). Han stated she does not want pigs breeding. She also stated the language about breeder permits needs to be clarified. KL’s response was unheard because her microphone was off. Claire Ramsey, 8412 West Gilmore Avenue, commented on 10.08.132(e) and encourages a no tolerance of backyard breeding. Scott Shoemaker, a member of the public, asked that the document be more consistent when referring to specific animals. Tiffany Voss, Clark County resident, asked that the board considers adding language to eliminate breeding of pot belly pigs. KL closed public comment.

KL reads through 10.08 and reviews the comments made by the public and committee. JA and KL discussed the included animals for sterilization in 10.08.132. JA clarified there is no language prohibiting the breeding of animals; only regulating the sterilization of certain animals. KL commented on the confusion of the outlined paragraphs in 10.08.132. Discussion was had about the breakdown of code sections. JA suggested eliminating the term “breeding” from section 10.08.132 and creating a new section for breeding regulations. MG agreed. KL, DW, and JA discussed 10.08.132(c), animals medically unfit for spay or neuter. DW asked how breeder/show permits are acquired and stated the language was confusing. JA explained the process and discussed with DW. KL asked for a motion. SSS motioned to only add public parks in section 10.08.095. Second by MG. 4 to 1, DW opposed, motion passed. SSS motioned to remove the term “breeding” from section 10.08.132. Second by DW. All in favor, motion passed. SSS motioned to remove “8 weeks of age” regarding piglets and correct language to “kitten or puppy or piglet” in section 10.08.132(e). Second by DW. All in favor, motion passed. Discussion is had about adding a new section for breeding prohibitions and specifying animal species in 10.08.140. DW motioned to add a new section, 10.08.190, prohibiting breeding of pot belly pigs, ferrets, and pet rabbits. Second by KE. All in favor, motion passed.

KL asked for committee comments on section 10.20.020. No comment from committee. KL opened public comment. No public comment. KL closed public comment. Discussion was had about membership terms. MG motioned to accept 10.20.020 changes as proposed. Second by SSS. All in favor, motion passed.

KL asked for committee comments on section 10.24. KL wanted clarification on the language of

10.24.080(a). Discussion was had between KL and JA about rescue organizations removing animals from shelters. KL asked if section 10.24.080(c) was referring to a “do not adopt” list.

KL opened public comment. Keith Williams, 4516 West San Miguel, commented on section 10.24.080. He said there should be no fee whatsoever by rescue organizations to take animals from the shelter. Don Kudler, a member of the public, would like to see the whole county as a “no-kill” zone. He asked if there was a right to pursue an owner for fees on keeping an animal by the county. SS expressed he would not comment on that topic. KL closed public comment.

KL wanted rescue organizations to be charged for vaccinations, sterilizations, and microchips. She was also concerned that a cost should be associated with animals to make sure they have proper care. MG would like to see animals taken to rescue groups instead of being euthanized. SSS thought if rescues incur costs anyway, they should be willing to take on more pets if they can afford it. KE asked if there are a limited number of animals that can be admitted to a rescue or shelter. JA stated there is a limited amount of space, but he hopes the code language gets animals into homes at a low cost. JA pointed out 10.24.080(b) changes will allow behavior analysis of biting animals. If animals are approved, they can now be adopted out with history disclosure. Discussion was had between MG, JA, and KL about animal fees between rescue organizations and the Animal Foundation. SSS motioned to accept 10.24 changes as presented. Second by DW. All in favor, motion passed.

KL asked for committee comments on 10.28 and 10.30. KE and DW stated the general term “animals” in section 10.30.14 is not specific enough. Discussion is had about specific animals to be separated from mother. JA suggested adding “medically necessary” language to the ordinance.

KL opened public comment on these sections. Janice Ridondo, North Las Vegas citizen, commented on rescue organization fees because public comment was not open for that discussion. Don Kudler, a member of the public, commented on section 10.30.140. He thought “medically necessary” should apply to the offspring and the mother. Lori Heart, of Henderson, wanted to speak on behalf of rescue organizations and asked the board to allow more public comment. KL closed public comment.

DW motioned to accept the changes in 10.28 and 10.30 with the addition of “medical necessity” in 10.30.140. Second by SSS. All in favor, motion passed.

KL asked for committee comments under 10.32. KL inquired if poison was included in 10.32.040; JA stated yes. KL questioned the phrase “other than an operator” in section 10.32.180 and JA explained the reasoning. KL was concerned with undealt issues about dogs held outdoors. JA presented the current standards for animals left outside. MG questioned the equine species role in the ordinance, which is mainly an outdoor species. JA, MG, and DW discussed the true definition of shelter and protection for horses under the ordinance. SSS and KL would like to set minimal standards for animals left outdoors. KL suggested future ordinances to keep animals inside during hot weather. JA offered solutions and suggestions for possible choices, but warns it is very subjective. DW, MG, and JA discussed physical signs of animals in heat distress. KE and JA discussed excessive heat warnings.

KL opened public comment. Don Kudler, a member of the public, wanted to keep the impoundment portion in 10.32.070(b). He stated the phrase “the county” should be added to the language under section 10.32.070(c). KL closed public comment.

MG and JA discussed 10.32.070(b); they concluded 10.24 covers impoundment. SSS motioned to approve proposed language in 10.32. Second by DW. Amendment to the motion was made to allow Animal Control to come up with minimum standards. Second to amendment by DW. All in

favor, motion passed.

KL asked for committee comments on 10.36. JA clarified the ordinance. KL opened public comment. No public comment. KL closed public comment. DW motioned to accept the proposed changes to 10.36. Second by SSS. All in favor, motion passed.

DW motioned to accept changes that have not previously been discussed. Second by KE. All in favor, motion passed.

5. Receive Presentation, Discuss, and Direct Staff on Changes to Chapter 10.16

SS informed the board of a flaw in section 10.16 as it does not provide hearings for dogs deemed dangerous. Don Kudler gave a presentation on dangerous and vicious animals. Kudler addressed problems in county code and animal hearing processes. SS mentioned he is currently drafting an agreement to not kill dangerous or vicious dogs. Kudler gave an update on a dangerous and vicious dog case from a previous meeting. JA, KE, and Kudler discussed victim compensation and owner's responsibilities.

6. Public Comment

KL opened public comment. Keith Williams, a member of the public, stated transferring qualified animals to non-profit organizations is the current industry standard. Ken Foose, Las Vegas pet store owner, commented that banning the breeding of all animals except cats and dogs is unenforceable. KL closed public comment.

7. Date, Time, and Agenda of Next Meeting

January 29, 2015 at 6:30 p.m. A calendar will be set for quarterly meetings in 2015.

8. Adjournment

KL adjourned the meeting. Second by KE.